

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

FEBRUARY 4, 2008

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Deputy City Manager
Debbie Igielnik
Jim Liberman
Scott Wilson

Absent:

Marc Lopata

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 23rd, 2008 were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD – SECOND UNIT - 2ND STORY ADDITION TO EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE – 7544 MARYLAND AVE.

Jeff Gershman, Attorney, Diane Lochner, project architect, and Aaron Walbrandt, owner, were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing the addition of a second story on an existing three-car detached garage for use as a second unit. The project involves removing the roof structure and adding a full second story to the existing garage. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit because the structure provides kitchen facilities, bath,

sleeping and living space as designated by the Zoning Ordinance. The owners anticipate the use as a guest suite for family member use. Therefore, the structure must meet the requirements as contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Section 2.21. Catherine stated that the existing residence and detached garage was approved by the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board in August of 2002. The applicant has submitted plans for a second unit with a kitchenette, bath, family/exercise room and sleeping room. In total, the square footage of the second unit is approximately 733 square feet, which is below the 1,000 square feet maximum allowed for second dwelling units in the R-2 Residential Zoning District. Access to the second unit will be from an exterior staircase. The height of the structure will be 19-feet, 11-inches, which is very near the maximum permitted for second units. As proposed, staff believes the second unit is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance provisions. Catherine indicated that staff has concerns with the design of the second unit and asked them to refer to Architectural Review Board staff memo. The applicant has stated that the use of the second unit will be for family use and guests. Notwithstanding concerns with the design, staff believes the proposed project meets all the regulations outlined in the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to Second Units and recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. All stipulations of Chapter 22, Article 2, and Section 2.21 be adhered to, as herein contained; and,
2. Architectural Review Board approval of the exterior design of the second unit addition.
3. That the HVAC unit(s) be shown on the site plan for approval by the City's Building Official prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Gershman introduced himself to the Commission as the attorney for the owners. He stated that two applications have been filed; one for a conditional use permit and the other for architectural review consideration. He stated the property is located on the south side of the street, east of Hanley Road. He stated the owners have three small children, ranging in age from 8 months to 4 years) and that they have lived in the home for a little over 5 years. A photograph of the home was presented. He stated the home is Georgian style with a detached, 3 car garage. He stated the home and garage were designed by Mitchell Wall & Associates, who are also the architects for this proposed addition over the garage. He stated the second unit, at 733 square feet, is less than the allowable 1,000 square foot for second units. He indicated that they are only adding about 5 ½ feet above the existing roofline to accommodate this second unit. He stated that they have to work with the existing footprint.

Mr. Walbrandt stated that he and his wife built this home a little over 5 years ago and now have 3 children so they need additional living space. He stated that they frequently have relatives over to visit and that they want to stay in Clayton. He stated that they have the need for expansion due to their growing family and that the expansion can only go up; not out.

Chairman Sanger commented that there is no site plan to review for this project.

Catherine Powers concurred.

Chairman Sanger stated that the first order of business is the conditional use permit. He asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the conditional use permit.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the use complies with all zoning requirements.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that other second units have recently been approved.

Chairman Sanger asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments.

None were received.

Being no further questions or comments, Debbie Igielnik made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to remove the garage roof and lowering the ceiling height of the garage to accommodate the second level. On the north elevation, a new door and exterior stairway are proposed to provide access to the second unit. On the west elevation, four small windows will be placed on the second story. The east elevation will contain three larger windows centered above the existing garage doors. The south elevation is fully brick-faced. The low-pitch roof will be shingled to match the primary house. The exterior of the accessory structure will be all brick to match the residence. Catherine stated that staff has concerns with the appearance of this expanded garage. As proposed, the design presents a very tall, boxy appearance without architectural features typical of previously approved second units, such as dormers or partial gables. Staff understands that the design is reflective of adding a story to an existing structure, while matching the roof pitch of the house, but the result is a structure lacking in façade relief to reduce the massing. Staff would prefer a design that is more appropriate to the site and its use as a subordinate structure to the main residence and therefore, recommends the item be continued so as to allow the structure to be redesigned to reflect a more appropriate appearance.

Ms. Lochner introduced herself as the project architect, stating that the garage matches the architectural style of the house. She reminded the members that they are only adding about 5 ½ feet to the height of the existing structure, which is a minimal impact. Views depicting the addition from Lee Avenue and from the alley were presented. She reminded the members that an apartment building backs to this property. She stated there will be minimal visual impact of the garage.

Ms. Lori Hermanson, 7600 Maryland, commented that there is a gazebo next to the house.

Ms. Lochner stated that the view from Maryland Avenue will also be minimal due to the box style of the structure. She reiterated that the structure is in keeping with the architectural style of the primary residence.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that the house itself is elegant and that he realizes that it is “boxy” but that it has nice detailing, whereas he does not see any of that detailing on the garage. He stated he also realizes that the garage is not very visible, but that it just does not seem to fit. He stated the west (right) elevation seems to be just a wall with several windows and no relief.

Ms. Lochner stated that the existing structure has a stone base.

Steve Lichtenfeld agreed, but stated that although this Board will not design a structure for an applicant, it lacks detail to fit with the house and almost looks pre-fabricated. He stated he is not comfortable with the way it is designed.

Scott Wilson asked if they considered adding limestone to the addition.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that limestone could help.

Ms. Lochner stated that they did not want the design to detract from the house.

Jim Liberman commented that they have succeeded in accomplishing that. He stated that some relief in the structure is needed and that it looks like a 1950's design. He stated he realizes that they have a roofline issue, but that the unbroken wall is not appealing.

Scott Wilson asked if this structure is near its allowable maximum height.

Catherine Powers replied "yes". She stated maximum height for accessory structures is 20' and this structure, as proposed, is 19'-11".

Ms. Lochner stated that more detailing could be considered with additional height, but that they cannot add more height. She stated they even dropped the existing floor to keep height below the maximum allowed.

Chairman Sanger stated that he would object to the structure going over the 20' allowed. He stated that with the comments already received, that he believes if a vote were taken, the project would be denied and the same or similar proposal could not be re-presented for one year. He stated that they can certainly ask for a continuance.

Mr. Gershman stated that he does not want to withdraw the application as they would have to start the process all over and that a continuance would be better.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to continue this item at the request of the applicant to give the applicant a chance to discuss the design further with staff. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and received unanimous approval of the Board.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – 2-STORY ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 6317 WYDOWN

Mr. Mark Critchfield, project architect, and Dr. Hall, owner, were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the subject property is zoned R-1, Large Lot Single Family Dwelling District and that the project consists of the construction of a 1,699 square foot, 2-story, approximately 24'-8" in height addition to the rear of the existing 3,093 square foot residence (excluding basement). Catherine stated that the site plan shows the downspouts connected to several 6-inch diameter storm lateral pipes terminating in the front yard with pop-

up emitters. The plans indicate that the drainage will be directed to the street away from neighboring properties. The Public Works Department has reviewed the drainage plan and finds it acceptable. Existing impervious coverage is 18.5%. After completion of the addition and other site improvements, the impervious coverage will increase to 27.7%. Trash will be stored in a trash enclosure on the back side of the garage and the HVAC units are located adjacent to the trash enclosure behind the garage and screened with a wood fence. A generator is proposed in the rear yard greater than 5-feet from the property lines and screened with a wood fence and plantings. New underground electrical service will be provided per City regulations. No trees will be removed as a result of this project. New landscaping is proposed to compliment the addition. The City's contracted landscape architect has identified 4 evergreens and 5 trees which will be impacted by construction. The applicant has indicated on the plans that the City's tree protection standards will be followed. In addition, the construction staging area has been adjusted per the landscape architect's comments to minimize root compaction. Catherine indicated that it is staff's opinion that that storm water mitigation is satisfactory and will not negatively impact neighboring properties. Due to the size of the lot, the impervious coverage after the addition is constructed, is proposed to be 27.7%, which is well below the maximum allowed of 55%. There are several trees which will be impacted by construction and as such, care should be given to avoid unnecessary disturbance to these trees. Catherine stated that staff's recommendation is to approve the site plan with the condition that City's Tree Protection measures be followed at all times and that the construction staging area is limited to those areas shown on the plans.

Mr. Critchfield presented a color rendering to the members. He stated that the house is arts and crafts style and that the owners insist that the addition look like it was part of the original structure.

The location of the subject property was briefly discussed. Chairman Sanger noted that it is the second house within Clayton city limits on Wydown, in the R-1 Zoning District.

Jim Liberman asked if water will be directed to the west.

Catherine Powers stated the water situation will not worsen with this addition and that the situation will possibly be better with the addition of pop-up emitters.

Scott Wilson commented that the plans were very well done.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers indicated that the proposed 2-story addition measures approximately 1,699 square feet (excluding basement) with a height measuring 24'-8", slightly lower than the existing residence. The project includes the removal of two exiting one-story additions off the back of the house and the construction of a 2-story addition featuring a family room, kitchen, and master bedroom suite. The exterior of the home is brick and the addition will incorporate brick to match existing. The windows will be wood clad, double hung to match existing. The entire roof of the

existing house will be removed and a new roof will be installed. The applicants are proposing a stone coated steel roof product which will mimic the look of a barrel-vaulted clay tile. The color will be sunset gold (reddish tan). The trash enclosure and HVAC units will be located behind the garage and screened with a wood fence. A generator is proposed in the rear yard and screened with a wood fence and landscaping. Catherine stated that the proposed addition incorporates a design that blends well with the existing structure and that the architect has proposed quality exterior materials in fitting with the existing residence. Staff has reviewed the manufacturer's specifications for the stone-coated roof and finds it to be an acceptable alternative to a traditional clay tile product and recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Critchfield stated that they have taken many of the elements from the existing north (rear) elevation and transposed them into the new north elevation. He stated they tried very hard to make the addition appear to have always been there.

A sample of the roofing material was presented.

Chairman Sanger asked if the existing roof is to be replaced.

Mr. Critchfield replied "yes".

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that it is nice to see such detail. He asked for an explanation of the roofing material.

Mr. Critchfield indicated that it is a metal pan molded to look vaulted. He stated it is available in various colors and that there are three homes in Clayton that have used this roofing material (two on Country Club Court and one on Wellington Way).

Scott Wilson asked if this roof choice was made because of maintenance issues or cost issues.

Mr. Critchfield indicated that the material is less expensive than clay tile and is more cost effective than asphalt shingles from a labor standpoint. He stated the cost savings over asphalt shingle is about 20 – 30%.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that if shingles were used, the appearance of the house would change.

Debbie Igielnik agreed.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there is a guarantee on the roofing material.

Mr. Hall indicated that there is a lifetime warranty on the material as well as a lifetime installation warranty.

Chairman Sanger asked about noise when it hails.

Dr. Hall stated that there are studs and air pockets underneath the roofing material to reduce noise.

Chairman Sanger asked if staff approves this material.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”; she stated staff was given a material brochure for review.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – FRONT YARD FENCE & REAR YARD PERGOLA – 501 W. POLO DRIVE

Mr. Ted Spaid, with SWT Design, contractor, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the 48” black metal fence will replace an existing “cattle fence” fronting Walinca Avenue. Since there is a row of trees and shrubbery, the fence will be screened. Additionally, to meet Building Code requirements, the applicant is proposing to extend the fence into the rear yard in association with the construction of a pool. Adjacent to the pool area, the applicant is proposing the construction of a pergola constructed of cedar wood slats & cedar lattice design. The owners will remove 24 caliper inches of trees and replace with 27 caliper inches. Catherine indicated that the proposed fence and pergola are an improvement over the existing conditions and recommend approval as submitted.

Mr. Spaid presented a colored site plan to the members, depicting the proposed fence and pergola (note the swimming pool was also depicted). He stated the existing fence will be replaced with this new black fence.

Chairman Sanger asked if the fence meets Code requirements.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”.

Mr. Spaid stated that the fence will screen the pool deck from Walinca and that ornamental shrubs will also be planted along Walinca to replace the existing honeysuckle.

Chairman Sanger asked staff to make sure the 48” fence height meets the Code requirement.

Mr. Spaid stated that he was told 48” met Code.

Jim Liberman asked how the pergola structure stays upright...he asked if it can be pushed over.

Mr. Spaid stated that the posts that are used for installing a pergola are longer than posts used for a typical fence.

Jason Jaggi informed the members that a building permit will be required.

Jim Liberman commented that he just does not want the pergola to fall over.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated eliminating the cow fence and the addition of plantings are in particular an improvement.

Mr. Spaid advised the members that there are no plans to change the existing garage.

Scott Wilson asked if each gate will have an alarm.

Mr. Spaid replied “yes”. He added that the gate to the pool area will be locked.

Chairman Sanger reminded the members that these issues are code issues and will be considered during building permit review.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve as submitted with the condition that the fence meets the minimum height requirement per Code. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

Chairman Sanger announced that he will not be in attendance at the next meeting (February 19th).

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Recording Secretary